REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler (U.S. 6,584,493) in view of Tang et al. (U.S. 6,349,327) in further view of Harrison et al. (6,539,483). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are patentable because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches "monitoring said respective management processes with a single supervisor process to determine whether a quality of service is met; and when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process comprises a new collaboration server or a new application server" as required by each of these claims.

Butler does not teach or suggest "when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process is a new collaboration server or a new application server." While Butler discloses dynamically allocating memory to each member of a conference, Butler does not disclose, teach or suggest spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server based on a determination that a quality of service is not being met. Adjusting the allocation of memory does not teach or suggest spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server, which provides additional services for the online conference.

Harrison does not disclose spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server. Harrison is directed to a Virtual Private Network (VPN) for providing secure private communications among devices over a public network, e.g., the Internet. A VPN device communicates with another VPN device based on a VPN policy, which defines a set of actions, e.g., IPsec key and data management actions, for establishing a secure private connection between the VPN devices. Harrison is concerned with the problem of configuring a large number of VPN policies for a network having many VPN devices. See, e.g., col. 3, lines 18-26. As Harrison explains, configuring VPN policies on a device-by-device basis for 1,000 VPN devices requires configuring 999 policies on the 1,000 VPN devices, resulting in a total configuration of 999,000

7

policies, which is very labor intensive. See e.g., col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 8. Harrison addresses the problem of configuring VPN policies for many devices by grouping devices into policy segments, in which a group of devices in a policy segment are connected based on common policy components. See, e.g., col. 6, lines 9-26. The passages of Harrison cited by the Office Action discuss grouping devices into a policy segment, not spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or application server. More particularly, col. 6, lines 16-26 discusses grouping devices in a policy segment and specifying the devices in the policy segment in a device list. Col. 6, lines 58-68 discusses a policy segment providing policies for a collection of devices and the different types of connections that can be made among the devices in the policy segment, e.g., mesh, star connections. Col. 7, lines 33-35 discusses a process for defining a policy segment including selecting a policy segment name, policy segment type, and connection type for the policy segment. Nowhere in these cited passages or anywhere else does Harrison disclose spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server.

Because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches "monitoring said respective management processes with a single supervisor process to determine whether a quality of service is met; and when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process comprises a new collaboration server or a new application server" as required by each of these claims, Applicants submit that claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-24 depend from claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 28 is additionally patentable because none of the other references, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches "spawning a new management process; and associating the new management process with the new collaboration server or new application server, wherein the new management process is configured so that the new collaboration server or new application server is capable of communicating with every other said logical process." As explained with respect to claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, the cited passages of Harrison discuss a policy segment, which is a group of VPN devices that are connected based on common policy components. Nowhere in these cited passages or anywhere else does Harrison disclose spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration

server or application server, much less spawning a new management process and associating the new management process with the newly spawned collaboration server or application server.

Claim 29 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches "wherein the new collaboration server or new application server receives configuration, operating parameters, and current meeting data from the supervisor process." Since Tang does not disclose spawning a new collaboration server or application server, Tang can not disclose a supervisor providing configuration, operating parameters and current meeting data to the newly spawned collaboration server or application server.

C O N C L U S I O N

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 949-567-6700 at his convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: <u>May 29, 2007</u>

By: _____
Eugene Worley
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710